Sub-Inspectors in the Fishery Department.

164. * **Mr. J. T. MORAES**: Will the Government be pleased to state the number of Latin Catholic Sub-Inspectors in the Fishery Department?

MR. C. KUMARA DAS: Nil.

Post-War Reconstruction.

165. * **Mr. P. S. MOHAMED**: Will the Government be pleased to state the proposals and actions so far taken by them on the question of Post-War Reconstruction Scheme?

MR. C. KUMARA DAS: In regard to the proposals of Government in connection with Post-War Reconstruction, the attention of the member is invited to the Dewan's speech at the first meeting of the Post-War Reconstruction Committee, a copy of which is placed on the table and his speech at the joint session of the Legislature on the 14th August 1944. With a view to the investigation of these proposals, a Post-War Reconstruction Committee (with the Dewan as Chairman) has been formed and also several Sub-Committees. The reports of the Sub-Committees are awaited.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Appendix I.

Vide **Answer to Question No. 144**

RULES OF ADMISSION TO UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TRIVANDRUM.

1. ADMISSION TO THE JUNIOR INTERMEDIATE CLASS.

English	...	40 per cent for all groups.
Second Language	...	35 per cent for all groups.
Mathematics	...	50 per cent for group 1. 40 per cent for group 2.
Elementary Science	...	40 per cent for any combination including Science Subjects.
History	...	40 per cent for group 3.

2. ADMISSION TO THE JUNIOR B. A/B. SC. CLASS.
Candidates who have appeared for the Intermediate Examination more than two times are not granted admission to this class.

3. ADMISSION TO THE HONOURS CLASSES.
Candidates who have secured less than 50 per cent in the subject concerned are not admitted to the Honours Classes.

4. Exemptions to these Rules will not be granted.

Appendix II.

Vide **Answer to Question No. 145**

RULES OF ADMISSION TO UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TRIVANDRUM.

ADMISSION TO THE JUNIOR INTERMEDIATE CLASS.

English	...	40 per cent for all groups
Second Language	...	35 do. do.
Mathematics	...	50 do. for group(i)
	...	40 do. do. (ii)
Elementary Science	...	40 per cent for any combination including Science subjects.
History	...	40 per cent for group (iii).

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Appendix III.

Vide Answer to Question No. 160

In April 1940 the Travancore University Muslim Endowment Committee promised an Endowment of Rs. 50,000 for the purpose of encouraging Islamic Studies in the University. The President of the Committee remitted by instalments the endowment promised and the payment was completed by the end of January 1943. In addition to the Rupees 50,000 paid by the Committee, a sum of Rs. 50,000 was paid by Government as their contribution. There is thus a sum of Rs 1,00,000 under this endowment.

At the suggestion of Rajyasevapravina Khan Bahadur G. S. A. Karim, President of the Travancore University Muslim Endowment Committee, a small Committee consisting of the following persons was constituted to draft a scheme for the institution of Islamic Studies in the University.

1. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Chairman).
2. Dr. Hadi Hassan, M. A. (Cantab) Ph. D.,
   Head of the Persian Department,
   Muslim University, Aligarh.
3. Moulana Syed Sulaiman Nadvi,
   Darul Musonnifine, Azengah, U. P.
4. Dr. Abdul Haq,
   Principal, Government Mohammedan College, Madras.
5. Rao Sahib C. S. Srinivasachari,
   Professor, Annamalai University, and
6. Rajyasevapravina Khan Bahadur G. S. A. Karim Sahib Suhrawardy, M. B. E., (Convener).

This Committee prepared a Scheme for the institution of Islamic Studies and the utilization of the proceeds of this endowment. But the proposals of this Committee were found to be unsuitable and inadequate and they are therefore being considered again by the Muslim Endowment Committee.

The final recommendations of this Committee have not yet been received.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. K. A. MATHEW: Before we come to the next subject I just want to have one point cleared. I feel that it is derogatory to this House to put contradictory questions to the questioner who puts supplementary questions to Government. I think there is no provision in the Manual to enable the President or the Government to put counter questions to the questioner when he puts a question. I make a protest against this.

PRESIDENT: Will the honourable member state his objection under any particular Rule?

MR. K. A. MATHEW: We want to get information from the Government. It is not for us to supply the information.

PRESIDENT: Order, order. The question arises only in this way. If honourable members have not got the courage of their convictions but will make insinuations, and then withdraw them when the motion comes up, then the question arises that those insinuations must be exposed. For instance, I will make this a test case. A question is put thus:

"Will the Government be pleased to state the following regarding the Rubber Factory, Trivandrum:

(a) Who is running it at present?

(b) When was it leased out?

(c) Who was the Legal Adviser at the time?"

This question must necessarily have been put with a view to eliciting the name of some Legal Adviser. If finding it inconvenient to pursue the question honourable members merely do not put any further question, other honourable members will be asked to elicit the point or a statement will be made, because the object of that question is obviously to discredit Government with some nefarious connection with some Legal Adviser. There are many lease deeds executed by Government. Practically, dozens of these lease deeds are executed by Government every month. Legal Advisers to Government are well known, and the Legal Advisers to the parties are also well known. Those Legal Advisers meet and finish the documents. There is therefore, no reason for asking the question. "Who was the Legal Adviser?". I am making this statement in order to deal with the insinuation and the implications of that insinuation. This question was first raised through the information having been supplied to Mahatma Gandhi in the year 1939. Mahatma Gandhi was then told—the letter is dated 12-1-1939—that my son was a Legal Adviser to one of those companies which was being floated and that I also took some money in toll-gate contracts. I answered that letter on 17-1-1939. I had also another letter dated 25-1-1939 to which I replied on 30-1-1939. Mahatma Gandhi himself has told me that the information was supplied to him by members of the Travancore State Congress. I want honourable members to have this matter cleared. This question was raised as early as January, 1939, and it is again put here in August, 1944. I trust that honourable members will dissociate themselves from such insinuations. But, as that insinuation has been made, I propose to deal with it.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

It is false that my son had at any time been connected with the Legal Adviserships either of the old company or of the new company. Mr. K. G. Parameswaran Pillai was a member of the old company. He and Mr. A. V. Thomas and a gentleman (who is dead)- Mr. P. V. Swaminathan, and another person called Johnson, were partners who took over from the Travancore Government the lease of the Rubber Factory. Are you aware, Mr. K. G. Parameswaran Pillai of any Legal Adviser having been appointed in relation to that matter?

RAJYASEVANIRATA K. G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI (*Nominated*): സർ, ഈ കാര്യം–ൽ ഞാനൊന്നും തോന്നുന്നു റബ്ബർ ഫാക്ടറി ഗവണ്മെന്റിൽനിന്നും പാട്ടത്തിന് എടുത്തിട്ടുള്ളതു്. അതിൽ ഞാൻ ഡയറക്ടർ ആയിരുന്നു. അന്ന് ഞങ്ങളുടെ ലീഗൽ അഡ്വൈസർ മി. ടി. എം. വർഗീസ്സായിരുന്നു എന്നാണ് എന്റെ ഓർമ്മ. അല്ലാതെ മറ്റാരിൽനിന്നോ അല്ലെങ്കിൽ മറ്റേതെങ്കിലും സ്ഥലത്തുനിന്നോ ഞങ്ങൾ ലീഗൽ അഡ്വൈസറായി വന്നിരുന്നില്ലാ എന്ന് എനിക്ക് ഉറപ്പു പറയുവാൻ കഴിയും.

PRESIDENT: It is equally not true that the Legal Adviserships was offered to my son. But to leave the matter at this stage would not be to give a proper perspective of the case. Mr. Swaminathan and his colleagues Messrs. Thomas, K. G. Parameswaran Pillai and Johnson took over from Government a lease of the Rubber Factory. They were not able to manage the factory in a business-like fashion. They incurred losses. It was discovered that alkalies, chemicals etc., were removed clandestinely from Trivandrum to Alleppey. Notices had to be given in respect of that matter. During that time it is true that Mr. Swaminathan approached my son and asked him to intercede with me in giving him certain concessions. Normally some concessions could have been given, but as he approached me through my son, I declined those concessions. As a matter of fact the general rule has been that if any litigant, any person who applies for concessions either in cardamom estates or for the registry of large tracts of land approached me through my relations, my juniors or through people who have been serving in my office when I was a lawyer-practically every one of them has been engaged—I have decided against them wherever it was possible to do so, because that imputation should not succeed. Not only that. Even now certain Legal Advisers are chosen with certain ulterior purposes. But I think it must be clear to everybody who is asking for a concession that that concession will be more difficult to obtain than it would otherwise be, because of the appearance of that particular person.

Because the fact under discussion was known to some persons, it was communicated to the quarter to which I referred. In order that matters may be made perfectly clear I make this statement and if honourable members of the State Congress Party want to make any reply to my statement, I am ready to hear them.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. A. P. UDAYABHANU: As I was the member who put that question I want to make my position clear. I am absolutely unaware of any such information having been supplied to Mahatma Gandhi. It was an honest endeavour on my part to elicit the information. It is said that a retired Chief Secretary to Government also is in the service of that company. I wanted to know whether there are any Travancoreans in the service of the company. That is all that I wanted to know. It was never meant as an insinuation.

PRESIDENT: Order, order. Now that this statement has been made, I fully accept it.

As another point has now arisen I want to make it clear. Mr. M. K. Nilacanta Iyer, retired Chief Secretary to Government, has been employed by Sir Chinubhai in respect of some of his ventures. Government have had nothing to do in the matter and the fact that the retired Chief Secretary is functioning in the company in that capacity will not add to the influence which that company will be legitimately able to exercise on Government. I may definitely assure that.

I am glad that the State Congress member has made that statement, and I shall accept his assurance at its full face value.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: I raise a point of order. The honourable member.....

MR. K. A. MATHEW: I raised a question whether it was proper on the part of the President to put counter questions.....

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: Sir, on my point of order.....

MR. A. P. UDAYABHANU: Is he the Legal Remembrancer?

PRESIDENT: For the information and guidance of the members I may say that after question time it is open to any honourable member to ask for a Ruling from the Chair or to make any statement. The Chair can admit that. What is the point that you raise?

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: Sir, I wish to make a statement regarding the statement made by an honourable member of the House, Mr. Mathew. Sir, he stated that it was not proper on the part of the Chair to put certain questions to an honourable member for the purpose of elucidating further information regarding a particular question.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: Sir, the honourable member has misunderstood my point. What I said was, when an interpellation is put, it is for the Government to answer and not to ask for information from the honourable member. In this particular case, a question has already been put by the member. It seems to me that it is not for the Government to ask a counter question.

PRESIDENT: But the honourable member must remember that it is not the Government who put the question, but it is the Chair who put that. And if a question is imperfectly put, or if it does not convey the full effect of its implication, the Chair is entitled to elicit what the meaning of the question is and it is in that jurisdiction that I operated.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: Sir, according to me there is an express provision in the Assembly Manual regarding the powers of the President. I would refer you, Sir, to S. O. 74 which says that even in the absence of express provision, there is the inherent power for the President to regulate the conduct of business by putting any question on any matter that is under the consideration of the House.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: Is it not the President as Dewan who is regulating the conduct of the business?

PRESIDENT: No; as President he is regulating the conduct of business. That is why I did not make the statement at question time. The honourable member may realise, before he charges the President or the Dewan with want of propriety, that if I had to make a statement as Dewan I could make the statement only after question time. During question time, in regulating that matter I was making the statement in the capacity of President. In other words, the statement that I made was on behalf of Government and as Head of the Government.

MR. M. R. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil* cum *Nedumangad*): Sir, on a question of privilege. I wish to bring to your notice a very serious matter that has arisen on account of misreporting my speech by the Press. It is a matter of common knowledge that the representatives of the Press are as responsible in reporting the proceedings of the Legislature as of a court of law. I am afraid there have appeared gross misstatements of my speech and that therefore——

PRESIDENT: If the honourable member wants to raise the question of privilege, the uniform rule is that the question of privilege must be handed over to the Secretary, because otherwise, this is a very fundamental matter referring to the rights of the House and the question may not be adequately answered. If the honourable member will raise the question of privilege, I will have the matter investigated and the honourable member given the answer tomorrow.

MR. M. R. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI: I will explain. The paper called "Bharathi" which is published in Trivandrum and which has a wide circulation in my constituency, has reported my speech very inaccurately.

MR. K. A. MATHEW: May I know, what is the circulation of that paper in the member's constituency?

MR. M. R. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI: I know that it has a wide circulation; but I do not know the exact number of the copies under circulation.

PRESIDENT: Is it your point that the newspaper Bharathi has not reported your speech fairly?

MR. M. R. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI: Yes, Sir.

PRESIDENT: The matter will be looked into. The point arises this way. The newspapers report the proceedings according to their

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[President.]

exigencies and space and they have got a certain right to select points, in which case they cannot report the matter *in extenso*. If the honourable member will point out in what respect, the thing has happened, the speech is so gross as to grant a breach of privilege, I will look into the matter. It is important that no newspaper which is entitled to the editor's or reporter's privileges is to twist the speech of any honourable member nor should it be open to it to make inaccurate reports. In the circumstances, it is better for the honourable member to indicate to the Secretary in what respects, the report was wrong when I will have the matter examined.

DEMAND XXV—MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

MR. S. JOHN (*Surgeon General*): Sir, I rise to move for a grant of Rs. 17,63,385 under Demand XXV—Medical.

MR. C. K. SANKARA PILLAI: Sir, before I formally move my motion, I wish to bring to the notice of the House one matter. The present method of moving motions does not give the supporter of the motion a chance to do so straightaway. I may be permitted to explain the matter. Supposing a friend of mine wants to lend his immediate support to my motion, the present practice is a bar to his doing so straightaway. He is relegated to a position where he cannot give support to my motion, but he is given a chance to speak about the needs of his constituency. The urgency and support of the motion which I possibly may get from my friends could not be got in the present procedure. That is the first point. Secondly, there is another defect in the present procedure.

PRESIDENT: Is the member canvassing the ruling of the Chair?

MR. C. K. SANKARA PILLAI: I am only suggesting another method of procedure for the consideration of the Chair.

PRESIDENT: I do not quite follow. Now the member is called to make his motion. The honourable member may either move it or need not move it. If he does not move it, he may possibly have another opportunity to talk over the matter in a token cut. But at this moment he can only deal with the motion either by moving or not moving it.

MR. C. K. SANKARA PILLAI: It is my idea to move the motion. But before I formally move it, I have to submit a word. I would suggest that the present procedure adopted in the matter is one which requires reconsideration.

PRESIDENT: The member is not in order. In order to canvass the ruling of the Chair, just as Mr. T. P. Velayudhan Pillai did sometime ago, immediately after question time, the honourable member ought to take the permission of the Chair to canvass or to contest the validity or rightness of the procedure adopted by the President. While

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly